

He has taken a lot of different positions on a lot of subjects.

How about listening to the women who have gone through this like Maureen? Maureen is a 30-year-old Catholic mother of two, and lives in Massachusetts. On February 17, 1994 Maureen and her husband were joyously awaiting birth of their second child. On that date when she was 5 months pregnant a sonogram determined that her daughter had no brain and was nonviable. Her doctor recommended termination of the pregnancy.

On February 18, 1994, a third-degree sonogram at New England Medical Center in Boston confirmed the diagnosis that the baby had no brain and was nonviable.

Maureen and her family sought counsel from their parish priest, Father Greg, who supported the decision to terminate the pregnancy.

Mr. President, may I have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mrs. BOXER. Maureen found out that her baby had no brain. She is a practicing Catholic, and she went to her priest, Father Greg. On the record he supported her decision to terminate the pregnancy.

They named their daughter Dahlia. She had a Catholic funeral and is buried at Otis Air Force Base in Cape Cod, MA.

And Senators in this Chamber want to insert themselves into that family, insert themselves into the dialog between her priest, her God, and her family?

President Clinton will sign a bill that outlaws this procedure with an exemption for life and health. Throughout this debate I will bring up example after example.

And I urge my colleagues. This is not about 30-second commercials. This is about the life of women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mrs. BOXER. We will continue this debate, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Is it time now to go to the bill at hand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, it would be time to go to the bill.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes, and I would be happy to share that time, half and half.

Mrs. BOXER. If there is no objection, I save my 2½ minutes until after the Senator is finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, the Senator from California makes a point—again, it is a good one—that the President will sign the bill with the exception for the life and health of the mother. That is what the President said.

I have two amendments. One, the health of the mother exception has

been consistently held even though it has been narrowly drawn by many State legislatures, the health of the mother exception has been interpreted by courts unanimously as being anything—financial health is the health of mother; social interaction, health of the mother; her age, health of the mother; maturity; emotional health; mental health; physical health. Yes. It is a limitation without limit. It is no limitation at all. And the Senator from California knows that. More importantly, the President of the United States knows that very well.

It is all how to frame the issue. It makes a lot of people feel comfortable that the President really does want to limit these things. It is only these serious health consequences, and that is reasonable until you understand that health consequences is not a limit on the procedure. It is not a limit on the procedure.

So to make a limitation that does not have a limit is just what I described before which is someone who wants to be judged by what they say to you that sounds so nice instead of what the reality of what their words would be which means partial-birth abortions would continue to go on in this country without limitation if we passed a bill that had a health limitation. That is not RICK SANTORUM, the Senator from Pennsylvania speaking. That is court after court after court after court interpreting language that you would believe would be rock solid. But with the judges it is not. So I would just say go ahead and continue to use it, as I am sure you will—that we could agree on this rhetoric. But I can guarantee you we cannot agree on this rhetoric. We cannot agree on a limitation that is a phony limitation; to a procedure that is infanticide and nothing more.

The second thing I would say is you have doctor after doctor who has written to us and said that this procedure is never medically necessary to save the life or health of the mother.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, once more I want to put on the table what the Members of the U.S. Senate could agree to at any moment. We would say this procedure cannot be used unless the woman's life is at stake because there is no true life exception in this extreme bill before us, or to spare her serious adverse health consequences.

And let me just say to my colleague in all due respect—and as collegial as I can be in the moment here—if you are suggesting that anyone in this U.S. Senate is talking about financial health of the woman, let me just say it is an absolute outrage if you would think that is what we are talking about. We are talking about infertility for life. We are talking about paralysis. We are talking about bleeding to death.

Vikki Stella, mother of two, was in the third trimester of her pregnancy

when she discovered her son was diagnosed with nine major anomalies, including a fluid-filled cranium with no brain tissue at all, compacted flattened vertebrae, and skeletal dysplasia. The doctor told her the baby would never live outside the womb. She said, "The only option that would assure that my daughters would not grow up without a mother was a highly specialized, surgical abortion procedure developed for women with similar difficult conditions. Though we were distraught over losing our son, we knew the procedure was the right option . . . and as promised, the surgery preserved my fertility. Our darling son Nicholas was born in December 1995."

Senators in this Chamber would stand up to this woman and tell her, "Too bad, even though your doctor said it was necessary to have this procedure so you could have another child; too bad."

You know, I will tell you something. For people who say they want to get Government out of the lives of the people, this is extraordinary to me. Let us leave these tragic situations to the mother, to the father, to the doctor, to the priest, to the rabbi, to God. Let us think seriously. If it was your wife, if it was your daughter, and the doctor looked in your eye and said, "Your wife might die if I do not use this procedure," at that moment would you want him or her to use the procedure that would save that life?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you.

MARITIME SECURITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 4:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 1350, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1350) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to revitalize the United States-flag merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Grassley amendment No. 5393, to clarify the term fair and reasonable compensation with respect to the transportation of a motor vehicle by a certain vessel.

Grassley amendment No. 5394, to prohibit the use of funds received as a payment or subsidy for lobbying or public education, and for making political contributions for the purpose of influencing an election.

Grassley amendment No. 5395, to provide that United States-flag vessels be called up before foreign flag vessels during any national emergency and to prohibit the delivery of military supplies to a combat zone by vessels that are not United States-flag vessels.

Inouye (for Harkin) amendment No. 5396 (to amendment No. 5393), to provide for payment by the Secretary of Transportation of certain ocean freight charges for Federal food or export assistance.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation now with regard to time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 30 minutes debate, equally divided, on the rate issue, 15 minutes under the control of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] and 15 minutes under the control of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY].

Mr. STEVENS. I think it was our intention that we would have 1 minute on each side; Senator INOUE with regard to the Harkin amendment, and myself with regard to the Grassley amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that be the case. We have to have some time to move to table and make a comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. The remainder of the amendments are likewise controlled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a series of amendments to be voted on in sequence.

Mr. STEVENS. It was my understanding the Senator from Iowa wishes to withdraw one of those amendments. I ask he be recognized for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 5395 WITHDRAWN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask to withdraw amendment No. 5395. For my colleague from Iowa, this is not the amendment regarding which his amendment amends mine. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw No. 5395.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Amendment No. 5395 was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I understand I am recognized for up to 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 5396 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5393

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have been generally supportive of the practice of shipping a certain percentage of our U.S. foreign food assistance on U.S.-flag ships. I have in the past supported amendments designed to reform that program to ensure the costs of using the U.S.-flag ships are reasonable. But I have not been supportive of proposals that would essentially kill the policy of using U.S.-flag vessels, because I believe that U.S. maritime fleet ships are important to our national defense.

I also believe that when we are providing largess to other countries, we should do all that we can to also support U.S. jobs and U.S. industries. After all, we make sure that U.S. farm commodities are used in these food shipments. We do not go to other countries to buy the food to give it away. We use our own farm commodities. As long as costs are fair and reasonable, I believe we ought to use U.S. ships to haul a share of this aid.

My colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, says that I may be undercutting his efforts at reform. But my amendment is the only way to have real reform. What my amendment would do, is take any higher costs in-

volved in using U.S.-flag ships out of USDA entirely and put it in the Department of Transportation.

Senator GRASSLEY's amendment would essentially kill our U.S. maritime industry by sending shipping business to foreign-flag vessels. If, for example, a foreign ship would haul cargo for \$18 a ton, Senator GRASSLEY's amendment would give that business to a foreign-flag vessel if the U.S. ship was going to charge any more than \$19.08 a ton. Is that the price at which we will sell out our U.S. maritime industry, which is so important to military sealift and military security, \$1.08 a ton?

Or, if you are using container ships, if the lowest acceptable foreign rate, just to take a hypothetical example, is \$1,000 a container, Senator GRASSLEY's amendment would cut out U.S. ships if their rate is any higher than \$1,060 a container. So for \$60 a container we would give all that business to a foreign country.

I do believe, however, that supporting our U.S. merchant marine is properly a transportation function, rather than an agricultural or food aid function. Any higher costs of using U.S.-flag ships should not come out of the food aid budget but should, instead, come out of the Department of Transportation budget.

I will also point out that the amendment of my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, would still have any higher costs of U.S. ships coming from the agricultural food aid budget. I do not think that is right. I do not think that is real reform.

Let us be clear, there have been some gross exaggerations about the higher costs of U.S.-flag ships. But I admit freely there are some higher costs involved, because those U.S. ships must comply with more stringent environmental and safety regulations and because the people who work on them are U.S. citizens and they pay U.S. taxes. Those people who work on those ships pay Federal and State and local taxes. They have homes here in communities in our country. They pay property taxes. They support their local schools.

If you take the money paid for shipping food aid and give it to a foreign-flag vessel and to foreigners operating on those ships, they do not pay any taxes here, they do not support our local schools, they do not raise their kids in America.

All in all, the U.S. maritime industry runs a more responsible operation than flag-of-convenience operators that may sail under the flag of a foreign country with very lax standards. So our costs of operation are understandably higher.

In any event, then, there are some higher costs in using U.S.-flag ships. This is called the ocean freight differential. To the extent that USDA pays for this differential, there is some reduction in the amount of food aid that can be shipped. That is what I want to change. My amendment would simply shift all of any added costs of

using U.S.-flag ships to the Department of Transportation. There is clear precedent for my amendment. In fact, it would build on a partial shift of cargo preference costs to the DOT that we began in 1985.

Prior to the 1985 farm bill, 50 percent of U.S.-sponsored food shipments were required to be transported on U.S.-flag ships. There was a court decision that held that this requirement applied to commercial sales as well as to food aid. So a compromise was reached in the 1985 farm bill under which 75 percent of food aid—that is the donations and concessional sales of food that we give to people overseas—would be transported on U.S.-flag ships, but that commercial agricultural exports would be totally exempt from any cargo preference requirement, even if those sales were supported by U.S. export subsidies or assistance. So, today, less than 2 percent of our total agricultural exports are required to be transported on U.S.-flag ships. No commercial sales are under the requirement at all.

Part of that compromise that we reached in 1985 was that the Department of Transportation would reimburse the Department of Agriculture, for any increase in food aid shipping costs caused by that change in the cargo preference requirement from 50 percent to 75 percent. So, already the Department of Transportation covers a portion of any higher charges for shipping food aid on U.S.-flag vessels.

What my amendment would do is shift all cargo preference cost over. The Department of Transportation would reimburse the Department of Agriculture for all food aid shipping charges to the extent they exceed prevailing world shipping rates. My amendment employs the same reimbursement mechanism now used by the Department of Transportation to reimburse the Department of Agriculture for a portion of those costs. So my amendment will put the costs of supporting our U.S.-flag merchant marine—which I believe is vitally important to this country—where it belongs, in the Department of Transportation, not the Department of Agriculture.

As I said, I have always believed, and still do, that it is important to support our U.S.-flag merchant marine as a matter of national security. Also, because shipping is an important basic U.S. industry, with U.S. jobs at stake, employing U.S. citizens, people who work and raise their families here and pay their taxes in this country, I believe it is important to have a U.S. merchant fleet.

We cannot afford to send any more U.S. jobs out of this country. The Grassley amendment would do that. It would turn over everything to foreign vessels flying a flag of convenience. But that support, I say, that we should provide for our U.S. merchant marine should not diminish the quantity of agricultural commodities that USDA can ship as food aid. If we are going to give food to hungry people and starving people around the world—which we ought

to do—to the extent that it costs us more to ship it on U.S.-flag vessels, that money should not come out of the food aid budget, it ought to come out of our transportation budget.

I tried to offer this amendment several years ago, in 1990. It was tabled. Again, I recall my colleague from Iowa moved to table the underlying amendment and brought down that amendment, too. Unfortunately, the debate over cargo preference has pitted agricultural interests against maritime interests. That is too bad. In order to meet the stiff challenges from overseas competition in the trade arena, we need more cooperation, not antagonism among our basic American industries.

I am proud to represent an agricultural State. I am proud of how much we sell overseas. I am also proud of how much food the citizens of Iowa donate every year abroad. I am also proud of the men and women who go to sea in ships. Perhaps it is because of my military background. Maybe it is because I spent so much time in the Navy. But I know what a lonesome life it can be, and I know how hard they work, and I know how they sacrifice and give up a lot of time from their families. I also know when our country calls on that merchant fleet to ship military cargoes to a foreign country, in dangerous waters, they must respond.

Now, if it is a foreign-flag vessel, we cannot call on it to sail into dangerous areas for military purposes. They can simply say no, we are not going to ship your cargo because we believe it is too dangerous. So that is why I maintain my strong support for a strong U.S.-flag merchant fleet. And I believe as deeply as I believe anything that the funding to support our U.S.-flag merchant fleet should come out of the transportation budget, and I will continue to fight for that.

That is all my amendment does. Again, I hope that we don't have to have this antagonism between agriculture and the maritime industry. It shouldn't be there. We ought to be working together. We ought to be working together for the benefit of more jobs in the U.S., for the benefit of a stronger agriculture in the U.S. and, yes, working together to make sure that out of our generosity we give the maximum amount of food aid that we can give to starving people around the world.

I believe my amendment will resolve a nettlesome issue that has fostered conflict between agriculture and the maritime industry for a long time. My amendment will allow USDA to ship more food aid and to purchase more farm commodities for that purpose. And, yes, it will support a strong maritime industry. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes 50 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The senior Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, everyday, millions of Americans get up, they have their breakfast, they pack their lunches, they send their kids off to school. In many households, over a majority, both spouses work. These are the forgotten Americans, the people who go to work every day. They are working harder and harder and taking home less and less money. Nobody is talking on this bill about that portion of America. That is the America we should be concerned about.

So I use that to remind all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, that we are about to vote to create a new subsidy program, a corporate welfare subsidy program. I say to my Democratic colleagues—all of them—how many times do I hear you say that we should end corporate welfare? This is an opportunity to do that, by not voting for this bill and creating a new welfare program.

I say to my Republican colleagues who, in the tax bill last year, thought it was so necessary to respond to the people's will to eliminate corporate welfare, that we had in our tax bill probably \$25 billion of reduction in corporate welfare that is done through the Tax Code of the United States.

So I say to my Republican colleagues, you have an opportunity to have one less corporate welfare program on the books by not voting for this bill.

In the meantime, we have some amendments. We are about to cast votes on two of them that I have sponsored and one that Senator HARKIN sponsors, a second-degree amendment, and I strongly oppose his amendment.

In a few short minutes, I am going to attempt to help my colleagues separate fact from fiction. What I share with my colleagues is not just my opinion. It is either backed by independent sources or is the learned conclusion of those who have spent a great deal of time studying the questions of maritime subsidies.

First, let me direct the attention of my colleagues to two lead editorials that were included in today's Wall Street Journal on the one hand and today's Journal of Commerce on the other, and I placed copies on your desks. Both the Wall Street Journal and the Journal of Commerce expressed strong opposition to the subsidy bill before the Senate. Remember, these are opinions of journals that are the voices of business and transportation. They oppose this corporate welfare proposal.

My colleagues should also know that the Citizens for a Sound Economy, a grassroots organization representing hundreds of thousands of Americans, are key voting my fair and reasonable rate amendment and my antilobbying amendment. Those key votes are used for their Jefferson award.

We also have Citizens Against Government Waste backing my amendments and key voting those as well.

We have the National Taxpayers Union using these amendments for their annual vote analysis.

These groups, as well as Americans for Tax Reform, all oppose this underlying legislation, which is a \$1 billion corporate welfare subsidy bill.

Does our national defense, as is purported by the managers of this bill, depend upon the 47 U.S.-flag vessels that are asking for a \$100 million subsidy per year? A former Bush administration official, Assistant Secretary of Defense Colin McMillan, said the answer to that question is "No." He said that the issue of U.S. carriers reflagging is not a national security issue and, therefore, should be viewed in terms of economics. That is an Assistant Secretary in the last Republican administration.

Then on the other side of the aisle, most recently Cabinet heads in the Clinton administration studied this issue and made recommendations to the President on whether or not to continue subsidies. Every Senator had in his office last week a copy of the Rubin memo to President Clinton. Again, these are conclusions based upon President Clinton's Cabinet officials, their conclusions by Democratic officials, and they are not my conclusions. They said it amounts to a jobs bill to pay for high-price seafarers. Those are the conclusions from that memo.

Mr. President, as I stated last week, a number of retired admirals who earlier lent their names to an American Security Council letter endorsing this legislation—now that they have the benefit of the Rubin-Clinton memo—support my amendments to this bill and, in fact, believe further hearings should have been held before we pass such legislation. Again, those are retired admirals, not this Senator from Iowa.

To my colleague from Iowa, for his amendment and my opinion on that amendment—I suppose I gave that opinion last week, but I owe it to my colleague to state here now for a short period of time, my position.

My colleague from Iowa said that he doesn't want to sell out our merchant marines. Nobody wants to do that, but I think there is a bigger issue here, and that bigger issue is whether or not, with this corporate welfare subsidy, we will be in the process of selling out the taxpayers.

Our No. 1 responsibility is to the taxpayers of America. If my colleague from Iowa succeeds in substituting his amendment for mine, all that will be accomplished is that taxpayers will continue to get ripped off so maritime union welfare and corporate welfare will continue to be shoveled out with no restraint. And farmers, who are taxpayers as well, will not be able to ship one extra bushel of food overseas.

Taxpayers get ripped off either way. They get ripped off if the Agriculture

Department pays for cargo preference or if the Transportation Department pays for it. The end result is the same. So I strongly oppose his amendment.

Mr. President, why do we need to adopt, then, my amendment that calls for a fair and reasonable compensation? Fair and reasonable. Who can argue with that?

That supposedly is the rationale now for all of these rates, but the bottom line of it is that the maritime industry defines what is fair and reasonable. If we don't adopt this amendment, then these subsidized carriers will collect \$100 million per year from this bill and then routinely gouge taxpayers to the tune of \$600 million per year.

This figure of \$600 million per year is established by the Federal agencies and by the Office of Management and Budget. It is reported every year in the President's budget, and I placed a copy of this information in last Friday's RECORD.

Again, \$600 million in backdoor cargo preference subsidies is not CHUCK GRASSLEY's estimate, it is the actual figures provided by the Office of Management and Budget.

If we protect taxpayers from price gouging under Buy America laws, then why shouldn't we do likewise under cargo preference laws?

So my amendment then, does that. It takes the Buy America market test of 6 percent and, like Buy America, says that if a Government agency is charged by a U.S.-flag carrier more than 6 percent what the market bears or, in other words, what a foreign flag might offer, then that agency can hire the foreign flag.

For years, we have been assured that taxpayers are protected by existing law that states a bid has to be a fair and reasonable rate, but Congress never defined this term and, instead, left it to the Maritime Administration, which cares not for the taxpayers.

If you can have the U.S. flags charge 400 percent over a foreign flag bid, the Maritime Administration may state that this is a fair and reasonable bid and that agency has to accept that bid. It has happened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator has used the original 10 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. How much time does the Senator from Colorado want?

Mr. BROWN. I would like at least 2 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will yield myself 1 minute, and then when I sit down, I will yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I remind everybody who says that this is necessary for our national defense, to remember that U.S. News & World Report article in 1990 entitled "Unpatriotic Profits." It reported how the Navy was being forced to pay U.S.-flag carriers \$70,000 to ship what could have gone on foreign flags for just \$6,000.

This was during the Persian Gulf war. It was because our cargo preference laws are out of control. My amendment will take care of this.

If my amendment does not pass, we will see the same abuses the next war that we face. Nothing in this bill defines fair and reasonable rates. My amendment does define what is fair and reasonable in the very same way we have defined it in the Buy America. I yield the rest of my time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I hope Members, as they vote on this measure, will keep a couple of things in mind that I think are critical. One is this measure does not attempt to do away with the buy-America preferences that have existed in the law. It keeps those. What it does do, Mr. President, is define what fair and reasonable is.

In the past, literally, the Department of Transportation has looked at rates that have been 100 percent, 200 percent, 300 percent, 400 percent above what is available on the market and called those reasonable and fair. Mr. President, that is simply ludicrous. Charging double or triple what your competitor charges is not reasonable and fair. We do not kid anyone when we allow that sort of thing to go ahead. It is a scandal on the American taxpayers to have them stuck for two and three and four times as much what reasonable rates are.

The second point I hope Members will look at is this: One of the good arguments that have been made for those who defend the existing system is that, on occasion, what they are comparing is apples and oranges; that is, the higher rates that have been talked about at times—not always, but at times—sometimes have been in circumstances where you could not unload the cargo and it was not an apples-to-apples comparison.

The Grassley amendment, very importantly, is defined in such a way so that it allows the Secretary to take into consideration those other conditions that may exist. In other words, the Grassley amendment is an apples-to-apples comparison. It is a fair comparison. It is not an unreasonable comparison. It meets directly the arguments in opposition that the opponents of these measures in the past have made.

Mr. President, I simply close with this thought. How can we say to the taxpayers of this country that we are looking out for their interests when we allow them to get stuck for two and three times as much as what the real rate is on these kinds of cargoes? I yield the floor, Mr. President, and urge the adoption of the Grassley amendment.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes forty-eight seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. Four minutes forty-eight seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, again, I would just point out under the amendment of my colleague from Iowa, money that would go to pay for the ocean freight differential would still come out of the Agriculture budget, out of food aid. That is what I am basically opposed to, having it come out of Agriculture. It is a 6-percent limitation that my colleague has in his amendment, but any higher costs of U.S.-flag ships would still come out of Agriculture. I do not think it ought to. I think the money for the ocean freight differential ought to come out of the Department of Transportation. That is what my amendment does.

Again, I hear all of these comparisons of shipping rates. My friend from Colorado, and of course my esteemed colleague from Iowa, have all these comparisons, but these are based on artificially low foreign rates subsidized by foreign governments, or rates for ships that operate without having to comply with the operating standards that apply to U.S.-flag vessels. So these kinds of comparisons may seem appealing, but they do not reflect a fair or accurate representation of the factors involved in the rates charged by U.S. ships.

For example, our people are paid higher wages, our ships have to follow stronger and stricter environmental standards and our ships have to meet stricter working conditions and occupational health and safety requirements. None of these considerations is taken into account by the amendment of my colleague from Iowa. I keep pointing out that workers on U.S.-flag ships, U.S. citizens, pay Federal, State and local taxes. In fact, I am informed that existing Federal and State income tax requirements alone nearly double the cost of U.S.-citizen crews to U.S.-flag operators. Well, where do they pay those taxes? They pay those taxes here in America.

Mr. President, let me also point out that there currently are limitations in place on the rates that U.S.-flag vessels may charge for hauling cargo preference shipments. For non-defense cargoes, for example, by law preference is given to U.S.-flag vessels only when such vessels are available at "fair and reasonable rates," which are determined by an OMB-approved method based on detailed cost information submitted by American flagship operators. If U.S.-flag vessels are not available at fair and reasonable rates, they are not awarded the cargo, and foreign vessels may be used.

In summary, I again point out that what my amendment seeks to do is to shift any higher costs of using U.S.-flag ships out of Agriculture to the Department of Transportation where it rightly belongs. I do, however, strongly support keeping U.S. jobs here in this

country. I strongly support making sure that we support a maritime industry in this country and make sure it is there for us when we need it in periods of national emergency. I ask support for my amendment to shift those costs to DOT. I yield the floor and the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield back his time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. How much do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute twenty-three seconds.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 1 minute now reserved for the Senator from Hawaii and 1 minute for the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, in June 1992 the Journal of Commerce had an editorial in support of this program, this bill. In March 1994, a much stronger editorial was found in the Journal of Commerce supporting this measure before us. In 1995, the Journal of Commerce was purchased by the Economist, a British publication, and now in 1996 we find that the Journal of Commerce is opposed to this measure before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated May 2, 1996, from Assistant Secretary of the Navy John W. Douglass supporting this measure be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE
NAVY, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT
AND ACQUISITION,

Washington DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Seapower Subcommittee, Committee on Armed
Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: During the recent Senate Armed Services Committee Seapower Subcommittee hearing on Navy Surface Ship Programs, you requested a review from the Navy on the pending Maritime Reform and Security Act legislation. I have reviewed this bill, and strongly support the establishment of an active fleet of militarily useful, privately owned, U.S.-flagged vessels for our nation's defense, and provisions that strengthen our vital U.S. maritime industrial base and Merchant Marine.

This bill is important in helping the U.S. maintain a strong and responsive defense posture. Through the Emergency Preparedness Program, the Navy will have access to vessels during times of war or national emergency thereby enhancing the readiness of our seagoing forces.

I also view the Maritime Reform and Security Act as important legislation in supporting U.S. shipbuilders. First, the bill's preference for including U.S.-built ships and the requirement to notify U.S. shipbuilders of the intent to contract for new construction work should help to promote the stability of shipbuilders supporting the Navy. Second, the vessel eligibility provision setting limits on the age of vessels in the fleet will contribute to new construction orders and maintain a younger, safer fleet. Third, the bill's provisions that facilitate use of Title XI loan guarantees is also important to U.S. shipbuilders.

It is paramount that U.S. shipbuilders capture a share of the world shipbuilding mar-

ket to help sustain the viability of this important industry for the Navy's future and to benefit the Navy by reducing new construction costs. The success of U.S. shipbuilders in commercial markets is inextricably linked to programs such as Title XI.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide you with comments on this important maritime legislation. A similar letter has been sent, as a courtesy, to Senator Pressler, Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. As always, if I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. DOUGLASS.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter dated April 9, 1996, from Deputy Secretary of Defense John White, supporting this measure be printed in the RECORD, along with a letter from the Secretary of Transportation, the Hon. Federico Peña, supporting this measure.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, DC, April 9, 1996.

Hon. LARRY PRESSLER,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the Senate may consider H.R. 1350, the Maritime Security Act, in the very near future. I want to dispel any questions or concerns about the position of the Department of Defense with respect to this legislation. The Department of Defense supports fully H.R. 1350, the establishment of a Maritime Security Force, particularly, will greatly enhance the maintenance of an adequate sealift capability.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

JOHN WHITE.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,

Washington, DC, September 23, 1996.

Hon. DANIEL K. INOUE
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INOUE: At your request, I am writing to present the Administration views on Senator Charles E. Grassley's amendments to H.R. 1350, the Maritime Security Act of 1995. The Administration strongly supports Senate passage of H.R. 1350 without amendment when the Senate votes on this bill on September 24, 1996. Early enactment of this legislation is important to national security. The Administration takes no position on the merits of these amendments at this time.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

FEDERICO PEÑA.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, although the Harkin measure has much merit, I must advise my colleagues that we have not had a hearing on this measure. If that amendment is made part of the bill, I feel that at this lateness it might be the death knell of the measure. So I move to table.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield his time?

Mr. STEVENS. No. I was asking for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Hawaii to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to table is not debatable. It is not in order at this point until the Senator from Alaska has used or yielded his time. The motion to table is not in order until the Senator from Alaska has used or yielded his time.

Mr. STEVENS. That was not the understanding at the time we were going to make it. We are going to have one vote on Senator HARKIN's amendment and then a separate vote on this one. We were going to make the motion to table and vote. However the Chair wishes to do it—go back and read the RECORD—that is not the understanding. In any event, I will take my minute on the Grassley amendment, not the Harkin amendment, so we understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. This amendment would affect the rates for carriers of all Government cargoes, not just the rates set for cargo preference on agricultural cargoes. I remind my friends from Iowa, both of them, that we put \$10 billion into agricultural subsidies a year. We are talking about here in this bill reducing the cost of keeping this merchant marine available for our Department of Defense from \$200 million a year to \$100 million. For 10 years we will get it to \$100 million.

Senator GRASSLEY's plan is unnecessary. Existing law already allows the military use of foreign-flag vessels if the U.S. carriers' rates are excessive or otherwise unreasonable or if they are higher than the charges for transporting like goods for private persons.

In terms of cargo preference, the law already provides the rates must be fair and reasonable for cargo preference. As I stated Friday, this amendment will result in the loss of the majority of the U.S.-flag fleet. We need that for national defense.

I point out that during the Persian Gulf war, the charge for the foreign ships averaged \$174 per short ton and for the domestic fleet it averaged \$122 per short ton. We are preserving a merchant marine fleet for our defense purposes.

I move to table the Senator's amendment.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to table the Harkin amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the Harkin amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] is absent due to illness.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 297 Leg.]

YEAS—89

| | | |
|-----------|------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Frist | McCain |
| Akaka | Glenn | McConnell |
| Ashcroft | Gorton | Mikulski |
| Bennett | Graham | Moseley-Braun |
| Biden | Gramm | Moynihan |
| Bingaman | Grams | Murkowski |
| Bond | Grassley | Murray |
| Boxer | Gregg | Nickles |
| Bradley | Hatch | Nunn |
| Breaux | Hatfield | Pell |
| Bryan | Helms | Pressler |
| Burns | Hollings | Pryor |
| Byrd | Hutchison | Reid |
| Chafee | Inhofe | Robb |
| Coats | Inouye | Rockefeller |
| Cochran | Jeffords | Roth |
| Cohen | Johnston | Santorum |
| Coverdell | Kassebaum | Sarbanes |
| Craig | Kempthorne | Shelby |
| D'Amato | Kennedy | Simpson |
| Daschle | Kerry | Smith |
| DeWine | Kohl | Snowe |
| Dodd | Kyl | Specter |
| Domenici | Lautenberg | Stevens |
| Exon | Leahy | Thomas |
| Faircloth | Levin | Thompson |
| Feingold | Lieberman | Thurmond |
| Feinstein | Lott | Warner |
| Ford | Lugar | Wyden |
| Frahm | Mack | |

NAYS—9

| | | |
|---------|--------|-----------|
| Baucus | Conrad | Kerrey |
| Brown | Dorgan | Simon |
| Bumpers | Harkin | Wellstone |

NOT VOTING—2

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Campbell | Heflin |
|----------|--------|

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 5396) was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SIMON

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, to say that the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON, has influenced us all is an understatement. Our dress today is a recognition of his influence on all of us and our great admiration for him personally.

I would like to announce that following the vote many of us will participate in a tribute to Senator SIMON. I invite all of our colleagues to join Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, Senator MACK, and many of us in that tribute. We will not do it now. We will do it later. In the meantime, we will all enjoy wearing these great bow ties.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendments being offered by Senator GRASSLEY and to express my concerns about this bill. Members of the 104th Congress have tried their best to eliminate pork-barrel spending and corporate welfare. I believe we have made some progress, but clearly, as this bill demonstrates, we have a long way to go.

I support the amendments offered by my colleague from Iowa because this bill is nothing more than a taxpayer subsidy. It authorizes \$100 million per

year for the maritime fleet to provide sealift capacity in times of national emergency. Each vessel in the program would receive \$2.1 million per year for being enrolled in the program. This does not include the additional moneys that may be paid in times of war. The CBO estimates that the program will cost \$782 million in the first 5 years, including expenditures for the phasing out of the old system.

The bill has several problems. First, it does not allow the United States to requisition subsidized U.S. ships in a national emergency. It would allow U.S. flag-carriers to protect specific vessels from shipping materials to a war zone. If commercial interests determine which vessels go and when, we should pay them on an as-needed basis. We shouldn't pay for a benefit we don't receive.

Second, the bill does not require those seafarers who are in the Maritime-Security fleet to serve when called. During the Persian Gulf war, our country had to draw from a pool of retired merchant mariners to care for our fleet. That is wrong and it should be changed.

Under this program, merchant mariners can earn more money than their military counterparts for war-time pay. The bill should be corrected to make merchant-mariners bonuses commensurate with those of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. I have been told of one merchant mariner who was paid thousands of dollars for a few months worth of service during the Persian Gulf war. Most enlisted military officers received far less than that.

Finally, the bill must require those carriers who receive a taxpayer subsidy to carry war materials into the war zone. The maritime fleet must not be allowed to drop off war materials to commercially convenient spots. If the taxpayers are paying for this service, then it is our duty to ensure that they receive what they are paying for.

Mr. President, the defects of the bill are not figments of the imagination conjured up by a few budget hawks. The Vice President's National Performance Review recommended that all maritime subsidies be ended for savings of \$23 billion over a 10-year period. The Department of Transportation's inspector general concluded that the entire Maritime Administration and all of its U.S.-flag subsidies should be terminated. The Office of Management and Budget estimates that international cargo preference laws will cost Federal Government agencies an additional \$600 million in fiscal year 1996. A November 1994 GAO report said that cargo-preference policies support at most 6,000 of the 21,000 mariners in the U.S. merchant marine industry. That is an annual cost of \$100,000 per seafarer—at taxpayer expense. Additionally, Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union, and Americans for Tax Reform are opposed to the bill.

The Federal debt is more than \$5 trillion. Five years ago, the debt was \$3.6 trillion. Clearly, Government spending is out of control and Congress must place priorities in the way it spends taxpayer dollars. Most families live under a budget. Most have a limited amount of resources that they must spend on food, clothing, shelter, and the like. And many families have little left over for the extras in life. They don't spend for every whim because they know that they must stay within their means. Why can't Congress do the same? Why can't Congress spend the people's money on core tasks only. Why can't Congress forgo the extras?

It will take a colossal effort to control the Government's debt. But every long journey begins with the first step. I urge my colleagues to take that first step and vote against this bill. I thank the chairman and ranking member for the opportunity to express my concerns.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there are three votes remaining. One is the Grassley amendment. There is a second Grassley amendment, and then final passage, hopefully, on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent—this has been cleared—that each of these votes be a 10-minute vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5393

Mr. STEVENS. I move to table the Grassley amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] is absent due to illness.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 298 Leg.]

YEAS—65

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Akaka | Cohen | Feinstein |
| Bennett | Conrad | Ford |
| Biden | Coverdell | Frist |
| Bingaman | D'Amato | Glenn |
| Boxer | Daschle | Gorton |
| Bradley | DeWine | Graham |
| Breaux | Dodd | Harkin |
| Bryan | Domenici | Hatch |
| Byrd | Dorgan | Hatfield |
| Chafee | Exon | Hollings |
| Cochran | Feingold | Hutchison |

| | | |
|------------|---------------|----------|
| Inouye | Mack | Santorum |
| Jeffords | Mikulski | Sarbanes |
| Johnston | Moseley-Braun | Shelby |
| Kennedy | Moynihan | Simon |
| Kerrey | Murkowski | Snowe |
| Kerry | Murray | Specter |
| Lautenberg | Nunn | Stevens |
| Leahy | Pell | Thurmond |
| Levin | Reid | Warner |
| Lieberman | Robb | Wyden |
| Lott | Rockefeller | |

NAYS—33

| | | |
|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Abraham | Gramm | McCain |
| Ashcroft | Grams | McConnell |
| Baucus | Grassley | Nickles |
| Bond | Gregg | Pressler |
| Brown | Helms | Pryor |
| Bumpers | Inhofe | Roth |
| Burns | Kassebaum | Simpson |
| Coats | Kempthorne | Smith |
| Craig | Kohl | Thomas |
| Faircloth | Kyl | Thompson |
| Frahm | Lugar | Wellstone |

NOT VOTING—2

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Campbell | Heflin |
|----------|--------|

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, may we have order now? We have one more vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 5394

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 minute for the proponents of the amendment and 1 minute for opponents of the amendment, followed by a vote.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, my amendment says that H.R. 1350 subsidies, and that is \$1 billion in total, cannot be used for campaign contributions, cannot be used for lobbying and cannot be used for so-called public education. Congress has supported similar restrictions on different bills and programs in the past, but we have no such restrictions for this \$1 billion subsidy in this bill.

It was suggested last week that we provide for this. It could be done by a line item. If that is what is wanted, then I suggest to the proponents to put that in the bill, but it isn't in the bill.

So, consequently, I think we should make sure we don't allow these funds to be back-doored by the Maritime Administration for campaign contributions and for lobbying. Without this restriction, that is not certain.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there is a Corrupt Practices Act. As a matter of fact, the \$10 billion paid out of agricultural subsidies has no similar provision. This amendment is unnecessary. It is a killer amendment trying to convince Members to vote for amendments so the bill will go back to the House and die.

The purpose of this bill is to save \$100 million a year and to continue the pro-

gram of keeping the merchant marine available for the United States in time of emergency. It will cost \$100 million a year for 10 years under this bill, not \$1 billion, as that article on your desks says; \$100 million a year for 10 years.

I move to table this amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment No. 5394. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] is absent due to illness.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 299 Leg.]

YEAS—50

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Akaka | Ford | McCain |
| Bennett | Frist | Mikulski |
| Biden | Glenn | Moseley-Braun |
| Bingaman | Gorton | Moynihan |
| Breaux | Graham | Murray |
| Bryan | Hatfield | Pell |
| Chafee | Hollings | Pryor |
| Cochran | Inouye | Reid |
| Cohen | Jeffords | Robb |
| Coverdell | Johnston | Rockefeller |
| D'Amato | Kennedy | Sarbanes |
| Daschle | Kerrey | Specter |
| DeWine | Leahy | Stevens |
| Dodd | Levin | Thurmond |
| Dorgan | Lieberman | Wellstone |
| Exon | Lott | Wyden |
| Feinstein | Mack | |

NAYS—48

| | | |
|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Abraham | Frahm | Lugar |
| Ashcroft | Gramm | McConnell |
| Baucus | Grams | Murkowski |
| Bond | Grassley | Nickles |
| Boxer | Gregg | Nunn |
| Bradley | Harkin | Pressler |
| Brown | Hatch | Roth |
| Bumpers | Helms | Santorum |
| Burns | Hutchison | Shelby |
| Byrd | Inhofe | Simon |
| Coats | Kassebaum | Simpson |
| Conrad | Kempthorne | Smith |
| Craig | Kerry | Snowe |
| Domenici | Kohl | Thomas |
| Faircloth | Kyl | Thompson |
| Feingold | Lautenberg | Warner |

NOT VOTING—2

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Campbell | Heflin |
|----------|--------|

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 5394) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, America has relied upon its merchant marine, ports and maritime industries for both trade and defense since colonial days.

Today, we will vote to ensure that America will continue its maritime community into the 21st century.

Today, we recognize that America as a nation must make an investment in its maritime infrastructure.

Today, we will vote for a program which is an efficient and flexible policy that will allocate scarce public resources in a responsible manner.

This program will also guarantee that our Nation will have trained Americans to crew these vessels as well as the Department of Defense's pre-positioned and Ready Reserve Fleet.

This program will significantly reduce the cost of the Federal maritime operating assistance programs. We are talking about cutting the funding in half.

This program will eliminate outdated and unnecessary rules and regulations which limits and restricts the ability of U.S. flag vessels to compete and modernize their fleets.

I want to take just a moment and recognize the hard work of Congressmen HERB BATEMAN and Senators STEVENS, INOUE, HOLLINGS and BREAUX.

This has been a real team effort. These Members of Congress were actively involved in crafting and advancing this legislation. The journey for maritime reform started over two decades ago.

This particular bill has been on a 9-year legislative trip with over 50 hearings. Its time has come.

I also want to recognize the work of staff who assisted the process: Rusty Johnston, Jim Schweiter, and Bob Brauer of the House's National Security Committee; Earl Comstock of Senator STEVEN's staff; Jim Sartucci and Carl Bentzel of the Senate's Commerce Committee; and Margaret Cumisky of Senator INOUE's staff.

The full Senate has devoted nearly two full days for a spirited dialogue on this legislation. And, the Senate has considered a wide range of amendments. The bill is ready for vote on final passage.

I stand here today on the Senate Floor and proudly ask my colleagues to support the Maritime Security Program to guarantee that our Nation will have the nucleus of a modern, militarily useful active commercial vessels sailing under the American flag.

This vote will ensure that whenever the United States decides to project American forces overseas for either an emergency or national defense, there will be a maritime lifeline. I firmly believe that Congress has a duty and responsibility to guarantee that a real and viable maritime lifeline is maintained and provided.

We are the world's only remaining superpower and we have global interests and responsibilities. A healthy maritime community is essential for this role.

I stand here today representing a bill that enjoys wide and deep bipartisan support. It deserves your support and your vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. My information is, this is the last vote. After that last courageous vote, I hope that all Members will remember this is national defense—national defense—keeping ships available for emergencies, saving \$100 million a year. I urge the Senate to vote positively on this bill. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] is absent due to illness.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 300 Leg.]

YEAS—88

| | | |
|-----------|------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Feinstein | Mack |
| Akaka | Ford | McCain |
| Ashcroft | Frahm | McConnell |
| Baucus | Frist | Mikulski |
| Bennett | Glenn | Moseley-Braun |
| Biden | Gorton | Moynihan |
| Bingaman | Graham | Murkowski |
| Bond | Gramm | Murray |
| Boxer | Gregg | Nunn |
| Bradley | Harkin | Pell |
| Breaux | Hatch | Pressler |
| Brown | Hatfield | Pryor |
| Bryan | Helms | Reid |
| Bumpers | Hollings | Robb |
| Byrd | Hutchison | Rockefeller |
| Chafee | Inhofe | Santorum |
| Cochran | Inouye | Sarbanes |
| Cohen | Jeffords | Shelby |
| Conrad | Johnston | Simon |
| Coverdell | Kassebaum | Simpson |
| Craig | Kempthorne | Smith |
| D'Amato | Kennedy | Snowe |
| Daschle | Kerrey | Specter |
| DeWine | Kerry | Stevens |
| Dodd | Kohl | Thurmond |
| Domenici | Lautenberg | Warner |
| Dorgan | Leahy | Wellstone |
| Exon | Levin | Wyden |
| Faircloth | Lieberman | |
| Feingold | Lott | |

NAYS—10

| | | |
|----------|---------|----------|
| Burns | Kyl | Thomas |
| Coats | Lugar | Thompson |
| Grams | Nickles | |
| Grassley | Roth | |

NOT VOTING—2

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Campbell | Heflin |
|----------|--------|

The bill (H.R. 1350) was passed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, once again I want to commend two of the most outstanding bill managers we have in the U.S. Senate, the great Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, and the

great Senator from Hawaii, Senator INOUE. They have done yeoman's work on this bill and bills last week. So we are looking for another hard job for them to do that we will call on them to do before this week it out. Thank you very much for getting this bill passed.

JAN PAULK

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in the weeks ahead, as the 104th Congress comes to a close, we will be paying tribute to several of our colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, who, for one reason or another, will be leaving the Senate at the end of this year. But it is not only our fellow Members who will be missed.

The Senate will soon lose one of its longest-serving staffers, someone who has become a veritable institution within this institution.

I am referring to Jan Paulk, our Director of Interparliamentary Services. She has held that position since it was first created in 1981, and her exemplary performance in that post has defined its role in the life and the activities of the Senate.

Jan came to the Senate from Russellville, AR, a graduate of the University of Arkansas, and joined the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee under its then chairman, William Fulbright.

Her background in international matters made her a natural to head up our office of Interparliamentary Services.

In that capacity, she has been responsible for the administrative, financial, and protocol aspects of all our interparliamentary conferences. She has overseen all of the Senate's delegations traveling abroad with leadership authorization.

In short, she has been the Senate's combination of travel office and Department of State, part tour guide, part Chief of Protocol, part guardian angel to congressional families overseas.

Most Members of the Senate will have their own memories of Jan's helpfulness and thoroughness.

When things have gone smoothly for us at an international conference, we knew it was because of her meticulous planning. And when an unforeseen problem arose, we knew we could count on her combination of tact and toughness to straighten it out.

Jan has helped to plan countless visits to the Capitol by heads of state and heads of government.

As every Senator knows, these are not merely ceremonial affairs. They usually involve extremely serious matters of international commerce and diplomacy.

They can advance, or retard, our country's interests abroad, and are an important part of the Senate's special constitutional role in our Nation's foreign policy.

To put this tactfully, such visits are not always easy to arrange, but we could always rely on Jan to smooth things out before they could get rocky.

We all wish Jan well as she retires from the Senate. I know I speak, not only for our colleagues, but for our spouses as well, in wishing she were not leaving us.

We will miss her greatly.

And some of us will be sure to get her forwarding number in the confident assurance that, when we run into a particularly difficult problem, she will still be ready to lend a hand.

I want to take this opportunity to thank her, both for Tricia and myself, not just for her years of service, but for her calm in the face of crisis, her cheerfulness in the face of gloom, and for the way she gave real meaning and spirit to what we call the Senate family.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I rise to say thank you to a woman who has been a good friend of the Senate, a good friend to Linda and me, and most importantly a good ambassador for our country, Jan Paulk.

Fifteen years ago, when then majority leader Howard Baker created the Senate's Office of Interparliamentary Services, he asked Jan to head it. She has been doing that job and doing it well ever since. You might say Jan is the Senate's youngest institution.

I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues when I say we will miss Jan's professionalism when she leaves us soon to take on a new challenge as head of Tulane University's new Asia Foreign Leadership Program.

Jan grew up in Russellville, AR, population 8,000. She first came to Washington as a high school senior. She had won an essay contest at her high school. First prize was a trip to Washington and \$100 in spending money. She knew the first time she saw Washington that she wanted to make a career here in Government. She did return after college to work for Senator William Fulbright, first as a file clerk and then an assistant scheduler. She left Washington briefly to earn a master's degree in theater from Columbia University. To anyone who mistakenly suggests that theater was a successful diversion, Jan is quick to point out that there is a lot of theater in politics.

Jan returned to the Senate in 1971 as editor for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and spent 3 years editing the landmark war powers hearings.

In 1974, she was put in charge of travel and protocol for the committee, and in 1981, when Senator Baker created the Office of Interparliamentary Services to handle those same functions for the entire Senate, he asked Jan to head it. As director of Interparliamentary Services, Jan has overseen the Senate's official foreign travel—a tough job that requires the stamina of an advance person, the poise of an Ambassador.

She and her small IPS staff handle every detail, from arranging the transportation to coordinating with host governments to making sure Senators understand local customs.

Jan's work has taken her to more than 100 countries in every continent